



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,873	08/15/2001	Joerg Heilig	P5211 US	1840

24209 7590 05/25/2006

GUNNISON MCKAY & HODGSON, LLP
1900 GARDEN ROAD
SUITE 220
MONTEREY, CA 93940

EXAMINER

POPHAM, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2137

DATE MAILED: 05/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/930,873	Applicant(s) HEILIG ET AL.	
	Examiner Jeffrey D. Popham	Art Unit 2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 9-20, 24, 26-38, 42 and 44-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 9-20, 24, 26-38, 42 and 44-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Remarks

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-20, 24, 26-38, 42, and 44-53 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 2/28/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Yarborough does not disclose mapping rules including information on establishing the data transmission link between the client proxy device and the proxy server. The GPS of Yarborough sets up a main proxy control connection with the PPS (Column 5, line 65 to Column 6, line 7). After this is done, the PPS is allowed to send connection requests to the GPS over this connection, this request comprising information regarding the host that it wishes to connect to, as well as a port that the PPS obtained from a port to service map (Column 6, lines 39-49). After receiving this request, the GPS will create a connection with the destination host (Column 6, lines 61-65) and will thereafter complete the session connection with the PPS (Column 7, lines 9-20). The fact that this session connection between PPS and GPS is outbound is insignificant since the PPS is the entity that sends a request to the GPS for this connection. The information on establishing the data transmission link between the client proxy device and the proxy server can be viewed simply as being able to form this session connection request, or it can be viewed as being more in depth, including the port to service map and/or other components used by the PPS.

Applicant also argues that Yarborough does not disclose that the mapping rules include connection information of at least one port of the proxy server to at least one port of the at least one network server. As can be seen in Column 7, lines 9-20, the PPS knows the socket S2 on the GPS since it sends information to the GPS on that socket. The PPS also knows the socket S3 and the destination host because, once the connections have been established, GPD "sends a connection reply to PPS 18 containing the end-points for connection S3 to the destination host". The PPS additionally recognizes the destination host from the port obtained from the port to service map.

An additional grounds of rejection has been used for 7, 24, and 42, which is proper since the claims have been amended to state that the network connect module is now within the client proxy device, as opposed to simply being coupled to the client proxy device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-5, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yarborough (U.S. Patent 6,718,38).

Regarding Claim 1,

Yarborough discloses a system for enabling a user to access a LAN from a remotely located host in a computer network comprising:

A client proxy device adapted to receive a request of a client data processing device to access at least one network server (Column 6, lines 23-38), wherein the client proxy device includes a network connect module (Column 6, lines 15-49);

Wherein the network connect module, in response to the request, establishes a communication link including a data transmission link between the client proxy device and a proxy server coupled to the at least one network server (Column 7, lines 9-64);

The network connect module is arranged for retrieving mapping rules corresponding to the client proxy device and the proxy server, wherein the mapping rules include information on establishing the data transmission link between the client proxy device and the proxy server (Column 6, lines 8-14 and 39-49; and Column 7, lines 9-35); and

The network connect module further comprises a first sub-connection module including submapping rules having connection information of at least one port of the client proxy device to at least one port of the proxy server (Column 7, lines 9-40; sockets S4 and S2,

respectively); and a second sub-connection module including submapping rules having connection information of at least one port of the proxy server to at least one port of the at least one network server (Column 6, lines 15-49; and Column 7, lines 9-40; socket S3 and the host port, as in Column 6, lines 18-19, respectively).

Regarding Claim 2,

Yarborough discloses that the network connect module further comprises a network server selector wherein the network server is selected using information included in the request from the client data processing device (Column 6, lines 47-49).

Regarding Claim 3,

Yarborough discloses that the network connect module further comprises a network server selector wherein the network server is selected using information of a port at the client proxy device that received the request (Column 6, lines 23-49).

Regarding Claim 4,

Yarborough discloses that the communication link between the client proxy device and the at least one network server includes at least one port of the client proxy device and at least one port of the at least one network server (Column 6, lines 15-49; and Column 7, lines 9-40).

Regarding Claim 5,

Yarborough discloses that the network connect module is arranged to generate a list of assignments between at least one port of the client proxy device and at least one port of the at least one network server (Column 6, lines 23-49). The client and service information is stored in the memory vector array, and the server's port is mapped to the service based upon the service table.

Regarding Claim 7,

Yarborough discloses that the mapping rules further include address information of the at least one network server in the LAN (Column 6, lines 39-49). The address of the GPS is what the PPS thinks is the destination server, and once the port number for the service is sent to the GPS, the GPS will translate the port to the correct final destination.

Regarding Claim 11,

Yarborough discloses that the data transmission link between the client proxy device and the proxy server is established through a firewall restricting access to the LAN (Column 5, lines 1-13; and Figure 2).

Regarding Claim 12,

Yarborough discloses that the communication link further comprises:

A first mapping module including mapping rules having connection information of a port of the client proxy device to a port of the firewall (Column 5, lines 27-41; and Column 7, lines 9-20; PPS to firewall); and

A second mapping module including mapping rules having connection information of a port of the firewall to a port of the proxy server (Column 5, lines 27-41; and Column 7, lines 9-20; GPS to firewall).

Regarding Claim 14,

Yarborough discloses that the proxy server is located inside a firewall restricting access to the LAN from the outside (Column 5, lines 1-13; and Figure 2).

Regarding Claim 15,

Yarborough discloses that the proxy server is configured to allow access only to pre-selected network servers and services (Column 6, lines 23-57).

Regarding Claim 17,

Yarborough discloses a replacement module containing replacement information used when executing an application that is not proxy enabled, wherein the name of a network server is replaced by the name of a client proxy device and a specified port associated with the client proxy device (Column 6, lines 23-38).

Regarding Claim 53,

Yarborough discloses a system for enabling a user to access a LAN from a remotely located host in a computer network, comprising:

A client proxy device coupled to and adapted to exchange data with a client data processing device upon a request of the client data

processing device to access at least one network server in the LAN
(Column 6, lines 23-38), wherein the client proxy device includes:

A connection module for establishing a communication link
between the client proxy device and the at least one network server upon
the request of the client data processing device, wherein the
communication link includes a data transmission link between the client
proxy device and a proxy server device coupled to the at least one
network server (Column 7, lines 9-64), and the connection module selects
at least one network server in the LAN based on the request and further
wherein the connection module is arranged for retrieving mapping rules
corresponding to the client proxy device and the proxy server, wherein the
mapping rules include information on establishing the data transmission
link between the client proxy device and the proxy server (Column 6, lines
8-14 and 39-49; and Column 7, lines 9-35); and

The connection module further comprises:

A first sub-connection module including submapping rules having
connection information of at least one port of the client proxy device to at
least one port of the proxy server (Column 7, lines 9-40); and

A second sub-connection module including submapping rules
having connection information of at least one port of the proxy server to at
least one port of the at least one network server (Column 6, lines 15-49;
and Column 7, lines 9-40).

3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yarborough in view of Srisuresh (Srisuresh et al., "RFC 2391 – Load Sharing using IP Network Address Translation (LSNAT)", 8/1998, pp. 1-15).

Yarborough discloses that the mapping rules further include identifying information of the at least one network server in the LAN (Column 6, lines 39-49).

Srisuresh, however, discloses that the identifying information is address information (Pages 5-10, Section 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the LSNAT of Srisuresh into the secure session establishment system of Yarborough in order to obtain the benefits of both network address translation, namely to conserve globally-unique addresses, while allowing private networks to each have the same private addresses within, and load sharing, to lessen the amount of processing that a single server must provide by distributing such processing amongst multiple servers.

4. Claims 9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yarborough in view of Crichton (U.S. Patent 6,104,716).

Regarding Claim 9,

Yarborough discloses secure communications across a public network (Column 7, line 65 to Column 8, line 21), but does not disclose

that the link between the proxy server and the client proxy device is on a public network.

Crichton, however, discloses that the link between the proxy server and the client proxy device is on a secure communication via a public network (Figure 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the secure tunneling system of Crichton into the secure session establishment system of Yarborough in order to allow multiple private intranets to be connected in a public environment, so that they can securely share each others resources as needed, such as when cooperating on a project.

Regarding Claim 13,

Yarborough does not disclose that the client data processing device is part of a client network and the data transmission link between the client proxy device and the proxy server is further established through a firewall restricting access to the client network.

Crichton, however, discloses that the client data processing device is part of a client network and the data transmission link between the client proxy device and the proxy server is further established through a firewall restricting access to the client network (Figure 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the secure tunneling system of Crichton into the secure session establishment system of Yarborough in order to allow multiple

private intranets to be connected in a public environment, so that they can securely share each others resources as needed, such as when cooperating on a project.

5. Claims 10, 18-20, 24, 27-29, 31, 32, 34-38, 42, 45-47, 49, 50, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yarborough in view of Wasserman (U.S. Patent 6,304,969).

Regarding Claim 10,

Yarborough does not disclose that the request of the client data processing device to access at least one network server is authorized prior to establishing the communication link.

Wasserman, however, discloses that the request of the client data processing device to access at least one network server is authorized prior to establishing the communication link (Column 9, lines 12 to Column 11, line 30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the authorization system of Wasserman into the secure session establishment system of Yarborough in order to verify that the server is a legitimate server that is authorized to serve the client, as well as allow the server to verify the identity of the client.

Regarding Claim 36,

Yarborough discloses a computer system comprising:

A processor (Column 5, lines 41-64); and

A memory storing a method for enabling a user to access a LAN from a client device in a publicly accessible computer network and not directly connected to the LAN (Column 5, lines 41-64; and Figure 2), wherein upon execution of the method on the processor the method comprises:

Receiving at a client proxy device a data request from a client data processing device for data accessible from at least one network server in the LAN (Column 6, lines 23-38);

Establishing a data transmission link between the client proxy device and a proxy server connected to the at least one network server in the LAN by a module of the client proxy device (Column 7, lines 9-64);

Establishing a communication link between the client proxy device and the at least one network server by the module, wherein the communication link includes the data transmission link (Column 7, lines 9-64);

Establishing the communication link between the client proxy device and the at least one network server includes:

Retrieving mapping rules, by the module, corresponding to the client proxy device and the proxy server, wherein the mapping rules include information on establishing the data transmission link between the client proxy device and the proxy server (Column 6,

lines 8-14 and 39-49; and Column 7, lines 9-35); and further wherein:

The mapping rules include submapping rules having connection information of at least one port of the client proxy device to at least one port of the proxy server (Column 7, lines 9-40; sockets S4 and S2, respectively); and

The mapping rules further include submapping rules having connection information of at least one port of the proxy server to at least one port of the at least one network server (Column 6, lines 15-49; and Column 7, lines 9-40; socket S3 and the host port, as in Column 6, lines 18-19, respectively);

Mapping at least one port of the client proxy device to at least one port of the proxy server (Column 7, lines 9-40; sockets S4 and S2, respectively); and

Mapping the at least one port of the proxy server to at least one port of the at least one network server wherein the mappings are executed in accordance with the retrieved mapping rules by the module (Column 6, lines 15-49; and Column 7, lines 9-40; socket S3 and the host port, as in Column 6, lines 18-19, respectively);

But does not disclose authorizing at least one network server to serve the data request of the client data processing device.

Wasserman, however, discloses authorizing at least one network server to serve the data request of the client data processing device (Column 9, line 12 to Column 11, line 30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the authorization system of Wasserman into the secure session establishment system of Yarborough in order to verify that the server is a legitimate server that is authorized to serve the client, as well as allow the server to verify the identity of the client.

Regarding Claim 18,

Claim 18 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 36 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 35,

Claim 35 is a computer program product that corresponds to system claim 36 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 37,

Yarborough as modified by Wasserman discloses the system of claim 36, in addition, Yarborough discloses that the at least one network server serving the data request is selected based on a port of the client proxy device receiving the data request (Column 6, lines 23-49).

Regarding Claim 19,

Claim 19 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 37 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 38,

Yarborough as modified by Wasserman discloses the system of claim 36, in addition, Yarborough discloses that the at least one network server serving the data request is selected based on information included in the request (Column 6, lines 47-49).

Regarding Claim 20,

Claim 20 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 38 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 42,

Yarborough discloses that the mapping rules further include address information of the at least one network server in the LAN (Column 6, lines 39-49).

Regarding Claim 24,

Claim 24 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 42 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 45,

Yarborough as modified by Wasserman discloses the system of claim 36, in addition, Wasserman discloses that the request of the client data processing device to access at least one network server is authorized prior to establishing the communication link (Column 9, line 12 to Column 11, line 30).

Regarding Claim 27,

Claim 27 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 45
and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 46,

Yarborough as modified by Wasserman discloses the system of
claim 36, in addition, Yarborough discloses that the data transmission link
between the client proxy device and the proxy server is established
through a firewall restricting access to the LAN (Column 5, lines 1-13; and
Figure 2).

Regarding Claim 28,

Claim 28 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 46
and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 47,

Yarborough as modified by Wasserman discloses the system of
claim 46, in addition, Yarborough discloses mapping a port of the client
proxy device to a port of the firewall and mapping the port of the firewall to
a port of the proxy server (Column 5, lines 27-41; and Column 7, lines 9-
20).

Regarding Claim 29,

Claim 29 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 47
and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 49,

Yarborough as modified by Wasserman discloses the system of claim 36, in addition, Yarborough discloses that the proxy server is located inside a firewall restricting access to the LAN (Column 5, lines 1-13; and Figure 2).

Regarding Claim 31,

Claim 31 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 49 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 50,

Yarborough as modified by Wasserman discloses the system of claim 36, in addition, Yarborough discloses that the proxy server is configured to allow access only to selected network servers (Column 6, lines 23-57).

Regarding Claim 32,

Claim 32 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 50 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 52,

Yarborough as modified by Wasserman discloses the system of claim 36, in addition, Yarborough discloses replacing at the client data processing device the name of the at least one network server by the name of the client proxy device and a specific port of executing an application that is not proxy enabled (Column 6, lines 23-38).

Regarding Claim 34,

Claim 34 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 52 and is rejected for the same reasons.

6. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yarborough in view of Pistriotto (U.S. Patent 6,138,162).

Yarborough does not disclose that the client data processing device further comprises a registration module containing designation information wherein the client proxy device is designated as a proxy enabling execution of an application that is proxy enabled.

Pistriotto, however, discloses that the client data processing device further comprises a registration module containing designation information wherein the client proxy device is designated as a proxy enabling execution of an application that is proxy enabled (Column 7, line 37 to Column 8, line 14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the caching proxy system of Pistriotto into the secure session establishment system of Yarborough in order to allow the client to connect to multiple proxies, each containing multiple proxy agents, each handling specialized requests, thus making the system more efficient.

7. Claims 26, 30, 44, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yarborough in view of Wasserman, further in view of Crichton.

Regarding Claim 44,

Yarborough as modified by Wasserman discloses the system of claim 36, in addition, Yarborough discloses secure communications across a public network (Column 7, line 65 to Column 8, line 21), but does not disclose that the link between the proxy server and the client proxy device is on a public network.

Crichton, however, discloses that the data transmission link between the proxy server and the client proxy device involves a secure communication via a public network (Figure 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the secure tunneling system of Crichton into the secure session establishment system of Yarborough in order to allow multiple private intranets to be connected in a public environment, so that they can securely share each others resources as needed, such as when cooperating on a project.

Regarding Claim 26,

Claim 26 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 44 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 48,

Yarborough as modified by Wasserman does not disclose that the client data processing device is part of a client network and the data transmission link between the client proxy device and the proxy server is

further established through a firewall restricting access to the client network.

Crichton, however, discloses that the client data processing device is part of a client network and the data transmission link between the client proxy device and the proxy server is further established through a firewall restricting access to the client network (Figure 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the secure tunneling system of Crichton into the secure session establishment system of Yarborough in order to allow multiple private intranets to be connected in a public environment, so that they can securely share each others resources as needed, such as when cooperating on a project.

Regarding Claim 30,

Claim 30 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 48 and is rejected for the same reasons.

8. Claims 33 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yarborough in view of Wasserman, further in view of Pistriotto.

Regarding Claim 51,

Yarborough as modified by Wasserman does not disclose registering the client proxy device as a proxy at the client data processing device for executing an application that is proxy enabled.

Pistriotto, however, discloses registering the client proxy device as a proxy at the client data processing device for executing an application that is proxy enabled (Column 7, line 37 to Column 8, line 14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the caching proxy system of Pistriotto into the secure session establishment system of Yarborough in order to allow the client to connect to multiple proxies, each containing multiple proxy agents, each handling specialized requests, thus making the system more efficient.

Regarding Claim 33,

Claim 33 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 51 and is rejected for the same reasons.

9. Claims 24 and 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yarborough in view of Wasserman, further in view of Srisuresh.

Regarding Claim 42,

Yarborough discloses that the mapping rules further include identifying information of the at least one network server in the LAN (Column 6, lines 39-49).

Srisuresh, however, discloses that the identifying information is address information (Pages 5-10, Section 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to

incorporate the LSNAT of Srisuresh into the secure session establishment system of Yarborough in order to obtain the benefits of both network address translation, namely to conserve globally-unique addresses, while allowing private networks to each have the same private addresses within, and load sharing, to lessen the amount of processing that a single server must provide by distributing such processing amongst multiple servers.

Regarding Claim 24,

Claim 24 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 42 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Popham whose telephone number is (571)-272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jeffrey D Popham
Examiner
Art Unit 2137


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER